



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VI. — *The Acta ludorum saecularium quintorum and the Carmen Saeculare of Horace.*

BY PROF. M. S. SLAUGHTER,

IOWA COLLEGE.

IN one of the rooms of the National Museum, in Rome, is now to be found the inscription containing the *Acta ludorum saecularium quintorum*, for which Horace composed the *Carmen Saeculare*. The story of the discovery of this inscription by Italian workmen engaged in constructing a sewer on the left bank of the Tiber, near the Ponte San Angelo, in September, 1890, is familiar to every one.¹

The fragments of the stone bearing the inscription have been set up on a square pillar resembling the marble column on which the account was first cut, soon after the occurrence of the festival in 17 B.C. The pillar is between nine and ten feet high, and is three and a half feet wide. The inscription consists of 168 lines in majuscule type, and is very clear and easy to read.

Mommsen's edition of the inscription, undertaken at the request of the Italian government, appeared first in the *Monumenti Antichi publicati per cura della Reale Accademia dei Lincei*, Vol. I, 1891. A reprint was published in the *Ephemeris Epigraphica* for 1891 (pp. 225-274), though the copy was not ready for distribution until some months later. With the *Ephemeris* copy in hand, I made a study of the inscription while in Rome in the spring of 1894. The fragments of the stone have evidently been set up in their present position since Mommsen's reading was made. His brackets, showing breaks in the stone and consequent omissions of words or letters, include in at least twenty-five instances too few letters, showing that the stone has been rather roughly handled in the setting up.

¹ Cf. Lanciani, in the *Atlantic Monthly* for February, 1892.

A graver fault, however, in the Ephemeris copy, is the number of mistakes in the text, due doubtless in most instances to careless proof-reading. Since many students make use of the Ephemeris to the exclusion of other publications, it seems best to call attention to the mistakes in the copy.

Line 30, — read *collegio*, not *colle[g]io*. The word corresponds exactly to the word *collegio* in l. 40.

L. 34, — read *censuerunt*, not *censerunt*.

L. 54, — after *propter* the stone shows no long vacant space.

L. 54, — read *atqui*, not *atqu[e]*. The *i* is doubtless the stonecutter's mistake, since *atque* is called for by the context.

L. 91, — read *eodem*, not *ei* []. A piece of stone has been added, bearing the letters *em*. The word now corresponds exactly to *eodem*, l. 109.

L. 99, — read *XV virum*, not *XV virorum*, an evident confusion with *XV virorum* two lines below. The long form of this genitive is used but once in the inscription (l. 101); the short form is found twice (ll. 97 and 99).

L. 114, — read *ed[ic]tum*, not *edictum*. The line may have been broken in moving.

L. 115, — A confusion is caused by using brackets where there is no break in the stone to show omission of the first letter of the word *Ilithyis*. The stonecutter has again made a mistake in omitting this first letter, as there is no break in the stone nor space left for the letter.

L. 151, — read *Arruntius*, not *Arruntins*.

Attention should be called to the strange form *atallam* in l. 107, which Mommsen fails to mention in his notes on p. 273.

My chief interest in the inscription, however, has been in the added light that it throws upon the interpretation of Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*. It is true that previous to the discovery of the *Acta* we had much information regarding the festival at which the *Carmen* was sung, mainly in Phlegon's and Zosimus' account of the Sibylline oracles, the best edition¹ of which appeared but a few months before the

¹ Diels, *Sibyllinische Blätter*, Berlin, 1890.

discovery of the *Acta*. The third of these oracles, which relates to the secular games given by Augustus, and the official programme arranged for the occasion by Ateius Capito and preserved in Zosimus II, 5, should, however, be interpreted and corrected according to the official report of the celebration found in the inscription. The articles on the *ludi saeculares* in the various encyclopaedias and dictionaries are misleading, especially in what they say of the ritual order of the games. This is true of Wissowa's edition of Pauly and of the Nettleship-Sandys edition of Seyffert. These authorities have clearly been misled by following Zosimus. Besides the Sibylline oracles there are minor references in various authorities, all cited by Mommsen in the *Ephemeris* edition of the inscription (p. 225).

The discovery of the *Acta* is of great importance for the commentary on the *Carmen Saeculare*, substituting positive and accurate statement for conjecture. Even so good an editor as Gesner could cite authorities who imagined that there was presented at this festival a sort of Horatian drama in five acts made up of selected odes and sung at various times and places during the celebration. The discovery of the *Acta* has made such vagaries impossible. One editor has already taken advantage of this discovery and incorporated into his edition the results of Mommsen's labors, to the great improvement of the commentary. I refer to the recent edition of the Odes and Epodes by Mr. Smith,¹ whose very satisfactory introduction to the *Carmen Saeculare* makes it possible for me to omit further reference to the *ludi saeculares* or to the contents of the inscription.

In December of 1891, soon after the publication of the inscription, Mommsen sent a communication to the Berlin weekly paper, *Die Nation*, in which he took occasion to criticise the *Carmen Saeculare* from an artistic point of view, finding it faulty in conception and in execution. He claimed that a greater poet than Horace would have made better use of the magnificent opportunity presented by the splendid

¹ Smith, *The Odes and Epodes of Horace*, Ginn and Company, 1894.

array of gods celebrated in the festival. Both in this article and in his edition of the inscription (p. 256) he states his belief that the *Carmen Saeculare* is a Processionslied, a conclusion which, he thinks, the *Acta* force upon us and the poem corroborates. To his arguments and conclusions Professor Vahlen replied in a paper read before the Berlin Academy and published in the proceedings for November 24, 1892.

Let us examine the arguments, first as to whether the poem was intended to be sung in procession, and second as to whether the poet has blundered in its execution.

From the *Acta* (ll. 148-150), *sacrificio perfecto puer. XXVII quibus denuntiatur erat patrini et matrini et puellae totidem carmen cecinerunt; eodemque modo in Capitolio Carmen composuit Q. Horatius Flaccus*, it is evident that the words *eodemque modo in Capitolio* refer to a singing of the *Carmen*, in whole or in part, on the Capitoline. From the poem, Mommsen thinks that it must have been sung in part only on the Capitoline, because it would be foolish (*ineptum*), he says, to have Jupiter and Juno mentioned neither at the beginning nor ending of a hymn that was to be sung in its entirety before their temple. But since Jupiter and Juno are called upon in the middle strophes of the hymn and not in the beginning or end, he concludes at once that the hymn is a Processionslied, the first strophes being sung on the Palatine to Apollo and Diana, the middle strophes on the Capitoline to Jupiter and Juno, and the final strophes on the Palatine again to Apollo and Diana. *Eodemque modo in Capitolio* refers, then, according to his interpretation, to this partial singing of the hymn on the Capitoline.

But can the words bear this interpretation? Aside from the internal evidence in the poem, which belongs to another part of the discussion, it seems clear from the plain meaning of the words that *eodemque modo in Capitolio* refers to the singing of the hymn in its entirety. Moreover, in two other places in the *Acta* (ll. 82 and 109), we find the expression *eodem modo* referring to the whole of a certain performance that has just been mentioned :

L. 82,—eodem modo fruges acceperunt.

L. 109,—eodemque modo sellisternia matres familiae habuerunt.

Vahlen believes that the success of the hymn was so great that an encore was immediately called for, and that for the convenience of the immense crowd of hearers, the Capitoline was chosen for its delivery; in other words, that the second singing was an extra performance, having no connection whatever with the festival proper, and therefore making any special recognition of the Capitoline deities, Jupiter and Juno, unnecessary.

Smith, in the edition of the Odes and Epodes referred to above, not accepting the Processionslied theory of Mommsen, thinks that the ceremonies of the Palatine in their main features, including the singing of the hymn, were repeated on the Capitoline; for, he says, the words *eodemque modo in Capitolio* do not appear to refer to the hymn alone.

This is impossible, for how could the sacrifices to Apollo and Diana (*i.e.* the ceremonies of the Palatine) be performed on the Capitoline, or anywhere except at the temple of Apollo and Diana? And the position of the words in the sentence quoted from the *Acta*, coming, as they do, between the statement as to the number of the singers of the hymn and the name of its composer, would naturally confine the reference to the *Carmen*. The ceremonies of the third day could not have been repeated on the Capitoline, and it is out of the question that the ceremonies of the first and second day should be repeated, since the sacrifices to Jupiter are two days past, those to Juno one day past, and their altars long since dead.

In support of an encore, Vahlen cites a second performance of the *Frogs* of Aristophanes and of the *Eunuchus* of Terence, given on the same day because of the great success of the first performance. But I find that both of these illustrations must be called into question. Koch in his last edition of the *Frogs* (Einleitung, s. 17) does not say that the *Frogs* was repeated on the same day, but does say that it was repeated without alteration in the same year. The proof

for the repetition of the *Eunuchus* rests upon a corrupt passage in Suetonius (Roth, p. 292): *Eunuchus quidem bis die acta est*, where the old editors omit *die* and Ritschl reads *deinceps* (Reifferscheid, p. 29).

To me it seems more probable that the hymn was sung a second time, not because the ceremonies of the Palatine were repeated on the Capitoline, nor as an encore, but as a pre-arranged part of the regular programme, and that the Capitoline was chosen by Augustus for the second singing, because, besides being a central position, it was the chief seat of the worship of the gods of the religion of the old state, and he was not ready to break entirely with the past. The words *eodemque modo in Capitolio* came in naturally, therefore, in the account of the festival inscribed on the column, and needed no emphasis and caused no confusion. Moreover, the silence of the *Acta* in regard to a reason for its repetition argues against its having been an encore.

Lanciani, who agrees with Mommsen, thinks the *Carmen* too long to have been sung twice on the same day. This might be true had not the arrangement for its second singing been made beforehand, and time allowed for it in the regular programme. For a repetition under such conditions, less time would be necessary than for the solemn procession contemplated in Mommsen's view.

So much for the proof from the *Acta* alone. Let us consider Mommsen's further point that the hymn itself sustains his theory. He interprets strophes 10-13 (ll. 37-52) as referring to Jupiter and Juno, citing line 49, — *quaeque vos bobus veneratur albis* — as proof, and sustaining his point by a reference to the *Acta*, where it is stated (ll. 103 and 122) that oxen were sacrificed to Jupiter and Juno on this occasion, and cakes (l. 140) to Apollo and Diana.

We admit, with Vahlen, that the *Acta* sustain Mommsen's conclusion so far as the thirteenth strophe is concerned; that *bobus albis* (l. 49) must be associated with the Capitoline deities. This is a point which, before the discovery of the *Acta*, editors have not granted, having, as a rule, referred all of strophes 10-13 to Apollo and Diana (cf. Nauck and Kiessling).

Though it be admitted that the thirteenth strophe refers to Jupiter and Juno, there seems no reason to think that the admission carries with it Mommsen's conclusion that strophes 10-12 also refer to Jupiter and Juno. Vahlen shows by a comparison with the sixth ode of the fourth book that strophes 10-12 of the *Carmen Saeculare* must of necessity refer to Apollo and Diana. In this sixth ode, written after the composition of the *Carmen Saeculare*, but before its rendition, Horace calls upon Apollo and Diana as the gods that rescued Rome from the ashes of Troy, and the reference to Troy in these strophes of the *Carmen Saeculare* points to a similar close connection between Apollo and Diana and the founding of Rome. *Roma si vestrum est opus* (C. S. 37), and *Romulae genti date* (C. S. 47) must, in the light of Book IV, 6, refer to none other than Apollo and Diana. This prayer is analyzed by Vahlen in order to show that Horace consciously maintains a fixed proportion in his requests of Apollo and Diana and of Jupiter and Juno; the first openly favorable to the descendant of the Trojan race, to whom he says simply, *Roma si vestrum est opus* (the word *si* connoting "of course it is"); the second known as the old enemy of the Trojan race, whom he approaches hesitatingly after stating reasons and offering proofs of good will.

If then strophes 10-12 refer to Apollo and Diana, there seems to be no reason for continuing to believe in the Processionslied theory. If but one strophe refers to Jupiter and Juno, Mommsen's argument from the poem falls to the ground. Jupiter and Juno find a place in the poem for the same reason that the deities of the three nights are mentioned, for the sake of completeness. The *Carmen Saeculare* is the final performance of the festival, and in it the poet has undertaken to sum up in a sense the whole celebration.

Mommsen's objection that the poem is badly constructed because in strophes 10-13 (ll. 37-52) the poet confuses the hearer by seeming to refer to Apollo and Diana at first, but really meaning Jupiter and Juno, as *bobus albis* (49) shows, has been answered by the argument given above, namely that Apollo and Diana are referred to in strophes 10-12.

The *Di* in strophe 12 (ll. 45-46) is general and inclusive, as was *dis* in line 7, and as *cunctos deos* at the end of the hymn. In strophes 10-13 we first find Apollo and Diana referred to, then the general reference in *Di*, and last the particular reference in line 49 to Jupiter and Juno. The *Di* looks back and includes Apollo and Diana, and at the same time looks forward and includes Jupiter and Juno. The omission of the names of Jupiter and Juno in this place is intentional and deliberate on the part of the poet. The sacrifices made to Jupiter and Juno had been an important part of the first two days of the celebration, and the memory of them would be fresh in the mind of every auditor on the third day of the festival.

Granting that the points made above are well taken, it remains to see if Horace had a well-defined plan in his mind or if his order of mentioning the gods is loose, meaningless, and void of ideal significance, as Mommsen claims.

The hymn is first of all dedicated to Apollo and Diana, and all other deities are subordinated to them throughout the poem, but closely connected with this worship of Apollo and Diana is a strong undertone in praise and honor of Augustus, the giver of the celebration. Ever since the battle of Actium, Augustus had claimed Apollo as his special deity. He enlarged the old temple of Apollo on the promontory of Actium, and dedicated a magnificent temple to his worship on the Palatine (Propertius III, 31), and was desirous, as far as it seemed politic, of raising Apollo and Diana above all other gods as the special protectors of the new state. We see from the *Acta* that they are assigned the most important day of the festival, and from the *Carmen Saeculare* we see that it is from them that the greatest blessings are asked for the Roman race; the good morals of youth, the quiet of old age, wealth and children and every honor (ll. 45-48, reading the genitive and not the dative in lines 45 and 46).

It was a part of Augustus' plan that the new régime should be typified in this celebration, and to this end a complete break was made with the old manner of celebrating the *ludi saeculares*; instead of a three nights' festival, we find the

celebration continuing through three days and three nights; instead of Dis and Proserpina, gods of the underworld, worshipped with fear and trembling, we find at the night sacrifices the Ilithyiae, the Parcae, and Ceres, kindly intentioned deities worshipped with confidence; and in addition to these we find a group of the greater gods worshipped at the day sacrifices, the place of special honor in this group being given to Apollo and Diana, with avowed purpose on the part of Augustus, whose preference Horace makes the *Carmen Saeculare* serve; Apollo and Diana, the new gods of the Roman state, stand for new life and healing power, the new strength that under the protection of these favoring gods Augustus has imparted to the state.

The cycle is changed from one hundred to one hundred and ten years, and even the sacrifices are changed throughout; black lambs and goats for the Parcae, a black sow for Ceres, and cakes for the Ilithyiae take the place in the night offerings of a black bull and a black cow to Dis and Proserpina; Jupiter and Juno receive white oxen, the customary sacrifice of the greater gods, while an entirely new offering, cakes, is given Apollo and Diana, the same as to the Ilithyiae. This last seems to me to be a connecting link between the night and the day sacrifices, and to have been intentional and meant to be typical of the new order of things; to the Ilithyiae was entrusted Augustus' new legislation (*C. S.* 17-20), to Apollo and Diana Augustus' new state, and Horace very cleverly makes use of this design of Augustus.

The *Carmen Saeculare* divides itself into two separate prayers, aside from the invocations of the deities; the first includes strophes 3-8, closely and skilfully joined together, as may be seen on analysis; the second includes strophes 10-18 (ll. 37-72), which, besides naming the gods of the three days' sacrifices in such a way as to subordinate Jupiter and Juno to Apollo and Diana, allude to Augustus' connection with the Julian line, and consequently support his claim to be one of the race of Anchises. And it should be noted how hesitatingly the prayer (l. 51) is addressed to Juno

for a descendant of the hated Trojan race ; the confident *date* is dropped for the more modest *inpetret*, and proofs of Augustus' worth are offered ; he is *bellante prior* and *iacentem lenis in hostem*. This reference to his prowess furnishes the connection with the rest of the prayer, which consists in relating the benefits of his rule.

Mommsen seems to lose sight of all these facts when he condemns the poem as he does and accuses the poet of having blundered in its execution. Possessed with the theory that the hymn was sung in procession, he finds difficulty in knowing where to make divisions and finds confusion in the references to the deities and looseness in the order of naming them. But giving full significance to the fact that a new order is being ushered in with Apollo and Diana at its head and with Augustus as their earthly representative and special care, and interpreting the references to the gods as has been done in this paper, it must be granted that the *Carmen Saeculare* is one of the most carefully wrought out poems of a poet whose skill and cleverness are evident in the smoothness and finish of a large number of poems that have never been surpassed.